Where We Live and Where We Learn
HOUSING AND EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS, REPORT OUT

Thank you for attending Where We Live and Where We Learn, a forum on housing and education partnerships, hosted by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Housing Development Consortium Seattle-King County (HDC), and the Puget Sound Educational Service District (PSESD). This report-out details the presentations and small-group discussions from the forum.

Students and young people are the future of the central Puget Sound region's economic prosperity and resilience. Ensuring access to high-quality education for all residents within the region is a priority. Stable, healthy, and affordable housing supports families and helps deliver positive educational outcomes. Education, a paramount responsibility for both the state and local communities, increases neighborhood stability and access to resources for families.

The Forum: PSRC, HDC, and PSESD hosted a forum on March 5th, 2015 exploring the intersection of housing and education. The forum covered: successes and challenges in existing partnerships between housing authorities, schools, and others; future partnerships between education and affordable housing developers; and strategies to better support these partnerships through policy work. Throughout the event, attendees heard from regional and local education and housing leaders whose work demonstrates the reciprocal benefits of improving educational outcomes and housing affordability and stability.

Next Steps: As the region continues to grow, the **Puget Sound Regional Council** (PSRC) is committed to addressing housing challenges and solutions through an inclusive and holistic approach. The forum concept leverages PSRC's ability to reach across diverse interest groups to cooperate on regional issues. Moving forward, PSRC hopes to continue convening regional stakeholders collaborating across silos, including housing and education partners.

One way PSRC can assist housing and education partners is through designation of Preferred Sustainability Status, which qualifies prospective eligible applicants in the region to be awarded two bonus points in HUD-specific funding competitions. The application must satisfy certain regional goals and policy objectives. For more information, visit http://www.psrc.org/growth/growing-transit-communities/about/preferred-status-certification/

The **Housing Development Consortium's** newly launched *"Housing And…"* series aims to explore the obvious and not-so-obvious intersections between housing and other key issues facing our community, including housing and education partnerships. Throughout 2015, HDC will partner with member organizations, and organizations leading the work in their sector, to motivate our members, and community residents to action. It's HDC's hope that through these necessary conversations across sectors, current services and strategies will be reevaluated to provide better and more streamlined care to our community's disadvantaged. HDC's next "*Housing and…"* session will be focused on the intersection of Housing and Health, and will likely take place in June. We also continue to welcome comment from this most recent forum, and are interested in helping to build momentum around this issue through future meetings.

Puget Sound ESD will continue the school-community partnership work in the Race to the Top District Consortium Grant through the Deep Dive projects and investment fund. These projects support authentic partnerships between housing, schools, community organizations and families. PSESD will continue to learn and leverage this focused work in support of student achievement and the closing of the opportunity gap in the region. For more information visit http://roadmapracetothetop.org/ or contact Matthew Gulbranson, Community Partnerships Director at mgulbranson@psesd.org

PANEL

Moderator: Marcie Maxwell, Senior Policy Advisor for Education in the Office of Governor Jay Inslee

Education Initiatives in the Office of the Governor:

- Governor Inslee's Results Washington: A Working Washington built on education and innovation where all Washingtonians thrive. www.results.wa.gov
- Governor's outreach in local communities; support for the whole child; the continuum of education; closing the Opportunity Gap; economy for all.
- Cities are the best places to live, LEARN, work and play!
- Collective Impact occurs when organizations from different sectors agree to solve a specific social problem using a common agenda, aligning their efforts, and using common measures of success.
- 2015 Legislative Session policy and budget proposals reflect our values. Ample, sustainable revenue.

Why We Are Here:

Today we want to highlight best practices and innovative collaborations between housing authorities, school districts, non-profit housing developers, community organizations, and local jurisdictions and encourage new partnerships between the education and housing communities.

Student Homelessness:

We cannot and should not expect homeless students to succeed without proper support.

- There were 30,609 homeless students in WA in 2013
- The number of homeless students in WA has increased by 82% in the last six years
- Homeless students have lower proficiency in reading and math
- Homeless students are 60% more likely to drop out of high school[1]

Housing Affordability:

One major driver of family homelessness is lack of affordable housing.

- Households paying more than 30% of their income on rent will have less disposable income for other necessities, such as healthy food, healthcare, clothing, and activities.
- It is more likely that school aged children living in unaffordable housing show up to school unprepared to learn.[2]
- We cannot deliver students to school without the supports they need for the other 18 hours a day, and then blame our teachers.

Student Mobility/ Turnover:

Moving to a different school is common among children in the United States. Following a cohort of kindergarteners from 1998 to 2007, the U.S. Government Accountability Office reported that 31% changed schools once, 34% changed schools twice, 18% changed schools three times, and 13% changed schools four or more times before entering high school. Recent research suggests that student mobility/turnover poses serious problems for mobile students as well as their schools, teachers, and peers.[3]

---

[1] http://www.schoolhousewa.org/What_we_know.pdf
[2] Kids Count Data Center
[3] Reducing School Mobility: A Randomized Trial of a Relationship-Building Intervention

Housing as a Platform:

Recent research has highlighted the impact of stable, affordable, and healthy housing on education outcomes. This research shows that high quality and stable affordable housing in healthy neighborhoods leads to:

- Better school attendance rates and improved attentiveness in class for all students
- Uninterrupted school year and fewer school changes
- Financial security, leading to better school outcomes[4]

Housing and Education partnerships:

- High performing schools are integral to our neighborhoods and play a critical role in improving neighborhood quality.
- Place-based strategies for economic development often center on schools as a vital resource for family and children.
- The reciprocal benefits of increasing the availability of stable, healthy, affordable housing and increasing education outcomes for all students should inspire the development of strong partnerships between these fields.

District-wide Partnerships: Courtney Cameron, *Seattle Housing Authority* and Carri Campbell, *Seattle Public School District*

About the Seattle Housing Authority and Seattle Public Schools:

About Seattle Public Schools (SPS): 51,988 students enrolled in 97 schools. SPS has a 73% graduation rate.

About the Seattle Housing Authority (SHA): SHA serves 12% of all of SPS students (ages 5-19): 3,819 live in public housing and 4,656 live in households with a Housing Choice Voucher

About the Partnership:

Seattle Public Schools and Seattle Housing Authority embarked on a new partnership during the application process for the Choice Neighborhood Grant in 2011, focused on the Yesler Terrace neighborhood. Together with Seattle University and other high-leverage organizations (e.g. Catholic Community Services), these partners have started to provide wrap around services to families and students attending Bailey-Gatzert Elementary, a school with high rates of students receiving free or reduced lunch. Successes in this collaboration led SHA and SPS to see how they could expand their partnership and take it to scale to support their shared students.

The partnership is focused on alignment and coordination of policy, practices, and services in support of their shared students, with the intention of improving student outcomes and support families in self-sufficiency. Currently, the two organizations are determining which research-based metrics can be tracked to ensure youth are on a path to become self-sufficient adults.

The partnership is supported at the highest levels of each organization and currently funded through grants (Gates) and baseline funds. SHA and SPS are also imbedding components of the partnership work into SPS positions.

Successes and Challenges: Opportunities to Work Together

Success for this partnership means full integration of services. For example, rather than have a school recommend a student for a tutoring program at school (may have challenges with

---

[4] Housing as Platform for Improving Education Outcomes among Low-Income Children

transportation) the student is recommended for a tutoring program at home (in a family community); improved student outcomes, specifically chronic absenteeism which is a national issue for housed students; blended SHA/SPS positions; formal 3-5 year MOU; shared data set and agreement.

SHA and SPS continue to struggle to select the right data to track, and will be conducting additional research this year specifically to collect qualitative data. Common Core and new State Assessments could pose additional challenges.

The flexibility SHA has from HUD on use of dollars (Moving to Work) has allowed this level of coordination/partnership. In addition, as a District, SHA serves just a small percentage of families experiencing poverty.

Bringing two large bureaucracies together is a major endeavor. SHA and SPS agree that they need to make sure both institutions are well aligned and that the resources they have already invested are leveraged to maximize potential for families.

Baseline Data:

To determine the potential impact of partnership, SPS started looking at early warning indicators. The first question was: what strategic levers are going to change outcomes for kids?

- Course Performance
- Attendance
- Suspension/Expulsion
- Disaggregation by SHA community; property; Housing Choice Voucher/Section 8; public housing; school; feeder pattern; region; race; language; grade; gender; etc.

One finding from the analysis is that 20% of level 1 and 2 (students scoring below 40% percentile on MAP reading or MAP math) students are shared with SHA.

- 2/3rd of shared level 1 and 2 students are in households that receive housing vouchers and live all over the city, which means we need to think differently about how we align services because they cannot be located in public housing buildings/ developments.
- When SPS measured chronic absenteeism (10 or more absences) they found that the shared students are much more likely to be absent. For suspensions and expulsions the district average is 2.2%, for the shared students, over 7% are suspended or expelled. In terms of academic achievement the shared students are below the district average.

Expanded Data Set

SHA and SPS are looking to expand the data they collect to include on-time graduation, student mobility, rates of homelessness, and school readiness.

The partners are interested in focusing their efforts on specific data points as they narrow their scope. This will take time as they are still looking at the data-set to inform this thinking. The disaggregation of data from both perspectives is very important so SHA and SPS can identify which systems can own different components of the shared strategy and work.

The partners also need to balance qualitative and quantitative data. Meeting with families and community partners during focus groups at New Holly gave them a much deeper understanding of the needs which must be addressed to impact the more quantitative data. Both SHA and SPS are committed to ensuring both are included as their strategy is further developed.

Partnership Integration Continuum:
SHA and SPS feel they are in the "collaboration" and "coordination" stage of their partnership, but want to be fully integrated for their students and families. Full integration means shared

funding, shared staff, and strategic planning. Instead of bouncing between two systems, families should have access to have full wraparounds services.

- SPS and SHA are leaning into best practices of partnership. Both organizations bring expertise to the table (e.g. SPS internal evaluation/research, SHA has a staff person, Courtney, who deeply understands SPS) that the other organization doesn't have. The partnership is in the process of being formalized.
- It's time to collaborate, and flexible funding can address the needs outlined above.
- Good partnership attributes include planning together, being future-oriented, and considering broad organizational changes using the partner's lens.

Project Level Partnerships: Michael Mirra, *Tacoma Housing Authority*

Why A Housing Authority Should Be Interested In Education With Examples From Tacoma:

THA is interested in education for three reasons. The job at THA is to not only house families but to help them prosper, certainly for parents but emphatically for their children because we do not wish them to need THA housing when they grow up. THA counts success in school as an important part of this transformation. Second, THA is interested in education because as real estate developers, THA develops properties and communities that will not succeed financially or socially unless the schools that serve them succeed.

Third, THA is interested in education because the school district needs help. Tacoma has a very good school district, but children who grow up in deep poverty bring challenges to the schoolhouse door that even the best trained teacher in the best equipped classroom cannot address alone. The relationship between education and poverty has a special pertinence in Washington as our state plans to invest billions more dollars in public education. The State should not expect an adequate return on that investment unless it also addresses those aspects of child poverty that has a ruinous effect on school outcomes. Near the top of that list might be the homelessness of schoolchildren.

How a Housing Authority can influence school outcomes.

A Housing Authority can influence school outcomes for reasons that are true in most communities, including Tacoma.

- One in seven public school students lives in a Tacoma Housing Authority building or receives THA Section 8 Vouchers; one in 4.5 low income public school students lives in a THA building or receives its rental assistance.
- In housing them, THA is very involved in their lives. THA provides them with a very valuable housing assistance. It provides supportive services. It monitors their compliance with detailed federal program rules and leases. This gives the housing authority influence over their choices and behaviors.
- THA owns and manages very large properties, which provide good staging grounds for interventions, educational or otherwise.

Examples of how THA Engages with Education Partners:

College Bound Scholarship Program: The State Legislature made a promise to Washington students: that if they graduate from high school with at least a 2.0 GPA, stay out of serious trouble, and get admitted to a post-secondary school, the State will ensure the education is affordable up to the average cost of a public college. Yet to be eligible, each student must sign up by the end of his or her 8th grade year. When we started this, for lack of that bit of paperwork, nearly half the children in Tacoma and in the state were missing out on this promise. THA

resolved to sign up all of its eighth graders every year and accomplished this each of the last four years by adding the College Bound Scholarship application to the yearly paperwork yearly each family fills out. This was a good experience in how a Housing Authority can have an important influence at low cost.

McCarver Housing Pilot Program: McCarver Elementary School is a very important school in Tacoma. It is one of the oldest. It was the nation's first magnet school, in service to voluntary racial de-segregation program. Yet McCarver presently faces some notable challenges. Its student population is the poorest in the region, possibly the state. It has more homeless students than any other school in the region, probably the state. As a result, the school shows all the disappointing academic outcomes common to such schools. Notably, its student turnover rate ranged between 100% and 179% per year. These students are not transient because of their parents' occupation. It is not a farm worker population. It is a not a military population. It is a population transient because of homelessness and deep poverty. The research shows clearly that such mobility has a ruinous effect on school outcomes, for the students who come and go and for their classmates that must sit there and watch it happen. In response, THA and the Tacoma Public School District planned and launched the McCarver Housing Pilot Program. It has five elements. First, THA provides housing assistance to homeless families with a child enrolled in McCarver. The assistance starts high paying most of the rent and tapers down to zero after five years. Second, as a condition of receiving the assistance, parents commit to keep their children enrolled in the school. They also commit to do what school success requires of parents. Parents also commit to invest in their own education and employment prospects. Third, the program provides close support to help the parents reach their goals. Fourth, the program also includes the School District's investment in the school to make it worthy of the commitment it asks of the parents. The School District has made the substantial investment to turn McCarver into an International Baccalaureate Primary Year Program, a rigorous, internationally recognized curriculum. Fifth, the program has a third party evaluator funded by the Gates Foundation. Three years' worth of data show promise:

- The transient rate of the cohort families is below 3%
- The transient rate of the school is down to 75%
- Cohort students are scoring notably higher on reading
- The average income of cohort families has doubled (this average conceals some important details: about a third of the families are doing well and a third have made no progress largely due to disability, domestic violence, and drug or alcohol dependency)

These encouraging results have allowed THA and the School District to make two decisions, to turn the program at McCarver from a pilot to a regular offering of the school and to expand it to the other elementary schools with ruinous mobility rates because of student homelessness.

Tacoma Community College (TCC) Housing Assistance Program: Last year, THA launched the TCC version of the McCarver program that provides rental assistance to enrolled TCC students who are homeless for up to 3 years as long as they make progress toward a degree.

Rapid Rehousing for Homeless Students: Stephen Norman, *King County Housing Authority*

About the King County Housing Authority (KCHA):

KCHA houses 20,000 kids across 19 school districts in King County. Of these students 6,000 live in families who receive a Housing Choice Voucher. Many of KCHA's students are English Language Learners, 70% participate in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program, and others may have families who are struggling with other issues.

KCHA's efforts to partner with education organizations/programs have taken three different forms: place-based programs, mobility programs, and strategies to address homelessness (rapid re-housing).

Suburbanization of Poverty and Place-Based Initiatives:

One big issue for King County is the suburbanization of poverty. Families experiencing poverty have left the central cities for less expensive housing in the suburbs. Suburban jurisdictions are ill-equipped to support families experiencing poverty due to the concentration of supportive services in central cities. KCHA realized that there were few housing options with supportive/ wraparound services, so they decided to locate facilities where families experiencing poverty currently live. The Housing Authority's place-based approach in Bellevue, Highline, and Kent Public Schools involve increased access to quality early-learning and childcare programs, bridging cultural barriers between the school district and parents, developing high quality after-school and summer programs, and using data to assess progress. More than 6,800 KCHA children live within these three target school districts. Agreements exist with all three school districts to share data to progress against metrics for each unique location.

Access to High Quality Schools:

KCHA also wants its residents to have access to opportunity, which is why the agency is working to help families live in high-opportunity areas with access to high quality schools and employment. KCHA pays a higher rate of subsidy for families who move to high opportunity areas with higher housing costs. Additionally, KCHA is working to purchase workforce housing throughout the county, for instance the agency purchased a 30-unit complex in Mercer Island so that students may access the Mercer Island School District. Currently, 24% of KCHA children live in high opportunity areas.

Rapid Rehousing:

Another hurdle King County faces is student homelessness. There are over 6,000 students experiencing homelessness in King County. Through the McKinney-Vento Act, the state spends over $6,000,000 on taxi fares to ensure students experiencing homelessness stay enrolled in

their school of origin to maintain stability in the classroom. In 2013, the Highline school district identified more than 900 homeless children in its classrooms. Through a partnership with the Highline School District and its McKinney-Vento liaisons, KCHA developed a rapid rehousing pilot program to provide short-term rental assistance for homeless families transitioning to permanent housing. KCHA's current rapid-rehousing program has worked with 56 households with 144 children in the school district. Aside from providing safe, affordable, and stable housing for families, this pilot aims to save school district money in transportation costs federally mandated under the McKinney-Vento Act.

Engaging Families: Trise Moore, Federal Way Public School District

About Federal Way Public Schools

- 22,000 students
- 116 languages spoken by families enrolled in the district
- 37 schools
- Majority Minority district: 55% families of color

How the Federal Way School District Engages Families

Effective partnerships between housing and education happen when we step beyond institutional spaces to reach families. Many of us believe that families are hard to reach, but families have taught Trise Moore, Family Partnerships Coordinator for Federal Way Public Schools, that it's less about families being hard to reach, and more about public agencies' inability to reach and understand them beyond the traditional sense of 'outreach'. School Districts need to learn how to make families feel respected and honored by reaching out to them on issues that parents have identified as relevant and important. Then districts must follow up on the priorities our families have identified. Parents say that the district should:

- Create clear access and simplified processes and entry points for parents to share their views, become part of decision making teams and support continuous improvement
- Consider obvious and not so obvious barriers and help parents be part of the process for coming up with solutions.
- Instead of asking families for feedback afterwards, schools and housers should bring them into planning discussions early and include them in celebration and evaluation.
- Ask them who their trusted community partners and non-tradition leaders are and make sure to invite them to the table as well.

Strategies for Family Engagement

For 12 years, Federal Way Public Schools has had an advisory work group made up of parents and community leaders. This was critical for the school district, because it recognizes that the district does not have all the answers. One successful strategy has been to have clear entry points and opportunities for collaboration, including:

- Quarterly meetings involving key-community stakeholders that include childcare and dinner. Attendees are invited to reflect on the district's current initiatives and processes
- Family Liaisons who help families remain informed and engaged and who also support staff in their effort to develop partnerships with family's partners
- Hosting workshops, events, community meetings IN neighborhood locations like people's apartment buildings, community centers, library etc.

BREAKOUT TABLES: BUILDING ON SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIPS WITH NEW POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

After an engaging panel session, panelists and attendees broke out into small work groups to discuss the opportunities, challenges and needs in continuing to create and scale up these important partnerships. For the last hour of the forum, seven tables of our expert panelists co-hosted groups that rotated for three, 8 minute-sessions at each topic table. The topics and table discussion notes are outlined below.

Table 1: Replicating and Scaling up Existing Models

Facilitators
Michael Mirra, Executive Director, Tacoma Housing Authority
Giulia Pasciuto, Associate Housing Planner, PSRC

Background In the first section of this program, our panelists discussed several different partnership structures, including:

- Partnerships between school districts and housing authorities to expand opportunities for housing stability, improve educational outcomes, and increase parent involvement
- Partnerships between school districts and families to improve educational outcomes for school-aged children by providing resources for families.
- Partnerships between housing authorities and families to increase housing stability and improve educational outcomes by providing immediate housing for families and offering education resources within housing developments.

Table 1 discussed the challenges to scaling-up and replicating these models:

- Instability and scarcity of education **funding**
- Without **flexible** funding, partnerships can collapse
- You have to gain **trust** in the community where you work
    o Sometimes title and affiliation can make an entity seem **untrustworthy**, and residents won't want to engage. Engagement takes trust and people need to feel comfortable
- **Data sharing and metrics** are key to strong partnerships and to galvanizing public and funder support. However, data sharing across sectors can be challenging with different tracking system and privacy considerations.

- Strong partnerships need **strong leadership**, and a shared vision; however, even strong partnerships can collapse in the face of **high staff turn-over,** or when executive leadership can't find the time to be a champion for the program.

Table 1 discussed <u>what we need</u> to scale-up and replicate these models:

- We need to find the **right data and metrics** to learn which programs and partnerships are worth scaling up
- Housing authorities and school districts need to **grow into each other,** sharing staff, resources, etc.
- We need to figure out how to bring in non-profit developers and help them **shift their role** away from being a landlord, to one where they **engage residents** around important community issues.
- Use existing partnerships to **bring in other sectors** such as health, for a more holistic approach to access and service.
- **Peer to peer training**: let's learn from the experts already on the ground and doing the work, and get funders to **underwrite trainings**, not just the partnerships themselves.
- Work on the **image** of housing providers and public housing authorities, so they are also seen as service providers and connectors.
- Available funding for housing and education partnerships shouldn't be seen as an 'additional' expense – should be prioritized because we're getting better results from the same level of investment.

Table 2: New Models, New Partners

<u>Facilitator</u>
Loren Tierney, Member Services Director, HDC

<u>Background</u>
In the first section of this program, we learned more about the following partnerships:

- Individual School and Housing Authority
- School District and Housing Authority
- School District, Families, and Housing Authority

This table discussed the other entities that might strengthen future partnerships between affordable housing and education providers, in addition to which entities are missing from the conversation (e.g. Social Services, local government, and nonprofit housing developers):

- Transportation representatives should always be consulted when discussing moving people from one place to another (e.g. *from* home *to* school)
- Organizations, businesses, and agencies working in health
- Local government
- Local business – tap for enterprise funding, long-term partnerships, and employment
- Translators and multi-lingual access
- Community leaders so there can be a two-way dialogue
- Colleges and universities
- Charter schools

Table 2 also discussed <u>opportunities</u> to generate new partnerships and models:

- Currently, there is **an overall increase in collective action efforts** across sectors, so the time seems to be ripe for the creation of new partnerships

- More **diverse organizations** are coalescing around these social efforts
- It *can* be relatively easy to create and sustain **on-the-ground partnerships** with nonprofit housing providers/developers
- Many newer developments already have **access to wrap-around services**

The three groups at table 2 discussed <u>challenges</u> to generating new partnerships and models:

- There can be **distrust** and wariness between Housing Authorities and residents
- While it can be relatively easy have partnerships on a smaller scale between nonprofits, as mentioned in the opportunities, it is **hard to scale up** and have a larger impact
- **Funding and eligibility** can be a challenge for new partners
- **Implementation**: **different languages** exist between sectors. There might be a desire to partner, but sectors can't translate data, funding, etc. between each other, even when they're serving the same clients
- There are **no joint meetings**. Organizations don't know what other organizations do. There is no alignment, so organizations on the ground are duplicating work and efforts
- There is a certain **protectiveness of brand**, especially when things are going well. Too often, organizations are vying for the credit
- Among older communities and service providers, there is a **fear** of the new group of young people

Table 2 tackled these issues and also made some <u>recommendations</u> to moving forward:

- Large entities and housing authorities should be at the table, but shouldn't be setting the table. **Efforts should be grass roots** and community-driven when possible.
- Everyone should be at the table. **Get rid of delineated sectors** and silos – everyone should have a say and equal voice.
- Create better **knowledge and best practices** sharing between sectors.
- Create new ways of doing business; large entities should support **shared ownership**
- We need to **empower smaller organizations**
- Create "**common language**" that allows sectors to partner to serve the same clients
- Find a way to better **leverage the partnerships that already exist.**

Table 3: Data and Metrics

Facilitators:
Courtney Cameron, Strategic Advisor, Seattle Housing Authority
Carri Campbell, Director of School and Community Partnerships Seattle Public Schools
Erika Harris, Associate Planner, PSRC

Background
Metrics and data collection differ between the fields of housing and education, examples of metrics include:

Housing Metrics	Education Metrics
• Cost burden	• Graduation Rates
• Housing Quality and Overcrowding	• Achievement Gap
• Tenure and housing turnover	• Attendance

Table 3 discussed which metrics and data are most effective in showing the impact of housing and education partnerships

- Attendance
- Grades
- Reading ability
- Growth, mobility (academic stability) and families
- Number of times kids get asked to leave classrooms (disciplinary metrics, not just suspension and expulsion)
- Graduation rates
- Post-secondary enrollment

- Family income increases
- Percent moved
- Length of stay in housing and school (stability measure)
- Exits to homelessness (from housing to homelessness)
- Student success rate when stably housed.
- chronic absenteeism overall and SHA kids

Table 3 also discussed how to use collective metrics and shared data to strengthen housing and education partnerships:

- **Collective metrics** can help determine which programs work for different populations, as well as inform our questions, data gathering strategies, and outreach moving forward
- Metrics can help **identify gaps,** and **inform/frame policies**
- Collective metrics **justify funding** and provide **leverage for future funding**
- Metrics provide **message framing** for our advocacy work
- Metrics show the relationship of programs to outcomes, and prove a **theory of change**

Table 3 addressed the challenges to developing collective metrics and sharing data:

- We need to factor in and measure **transportation cost savings**
- **Confidentiality and privacy** could present a big barrier to sharing data and metrics across sectors or event agencies
- Figuring out what data is **relevant, accurate, and useful**
- Once data is collected, **resources (people and time) can be scarce** when it comes to processing raw data and communicating data to the relevant people
- **Funding data collection** is a challenge
- Deciding high leverage points
- Getting **input from stakeholders**
- Agencies are **protective of their data** and reluctant to share and add to the collective

Finally, Table 3 discussed <u>what we need</u> to develop collective metrics and share data:

- Organizations need **data sharing agreements**
- We need **buy-in on top** and a commitment to funding throughout
- We need to create **political will** to use and reward collective metrics coming out of different sectors
- Solicit input from stakeholders
- We shouldn't be reinventing the wheel, or duplicating our efforts. Look to organizations already on the ground, and at **best practices already in place**.
- How do we galvanize **statewide consensus?**

Table 4: Policy Support

<u>Facilitators:</u>
Kelly Rider, Policy Director, Housing Development Consortium
Yorik Stevens-Wajda, Associate Planner, PSRC

<u>Background</u>
Housing and Education policies are determined by various levels of government. Table 4 discussed the possibility for policy to support housing and education partnerships.

Federal Level	State Level	Local Level
- Affordable housing funding - Federal role in Education is limited: No Child Left Behind - Money for education	- Affordable housing funding and criteria - State programs for affordable housing development - Education policy is driven at the state level.	- Housing voucher strategies and criteria - Local programs for affordable housing development - Affordable housing policy strategy - Financing for education

Table 4 discussed <u>opportunities</u> to support housing/education through policy and partnerships:

- SeaTac currently holds land use policy/community outreach **meetings in schools**. These meetings help to find intersections between the two sectors for potential partnerships
- There is an opportunity to learn from the SHA-SPS partnership in that they **don't compete for budget** and funding
- School districts could **prioritize their own funding** (by applying for small grants) to foster partnerships (McKinney/Vento)
- **Change the language** from "schools should be better" to something like "a good community has kids ready to learn [which makes for good schools]"
- There has been **more engagement** at the local and state level around early learning – but we always need more, as it's so important
- Early learning – 20% of highline kids are going to preschool.
- **McKinney-Vento-type requirements for early learning programs**

Table 4 tried to address some of the <u>challenges</u> to supporting housing/education partnerships

- If an organization has limited financial resources – making a **choice between direct services and fostering partnerships** can be difficult.

- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction should be more engaged with homeless students. It's very focused on education (McCleary), which is understandable, but we need to get leaders discuss issue from a statewide basis.
- How do we **leverage additional funding**?
- Funding to build classrooms and funding to build affordable housing (from the Housing Trust Fund) both come out of the capital budget. Sectors should **partner for a bigger piece of the pie**, instead of competing for smaller shares.
- The **suburbanization of poverty** pits the city against region for funding
- **Siting is difficult** and many communities resist important facilities (shelters, services)
- **Change takes time** – students here today won't be here to enjoy success from long-term improvements. How do we reach today's *and* tomorrow's pupils?
- We have a **lack of communication** and engagement, especially from policy-makers
- How do we bridge McKinney-Vento liaison with housing providers?

Table 4 discussed the policy work needed to support housing/education partnerships:

- **Income discrimination ordinances**. Redmond/Kirkland/Bellevue ban income (i.e. housing vouchers) discrimination
- Get **programs closer to home**.
- More discussions among different entities.
- Pass **document recording fee** legislation at state level
- Get more landlords in support of housing choice legislation
- Think long-term to **manage neighborhood opposition** – communities react to proposals, but long-term planning for facilities could smooth the way
- King County **mitigation project** (human services levy) – money to cover deposits, etc.

Table 5: Funding and Partnerships

<u>Facilitators</u>
Marcie Maxwell, Senior Policy Advisor for Education, Office of Governor Jay Inslee
Mary Pat Lawler, Program Manager, PSRC

<u>Background</u>

Funding for current Housing and Education partnerships come from public and private sources.

Existing Funding Sources

- Gates Foundation
- Housing and Urban Development (Federal) and other leveraged sources
- Department of Education (Federal) and other leveraged sources
- Local Schools

Table 5 discussed <u>potential sources of funding</u> that already exist to support housing and education partnerships:

- HUD: Choice Neighborhoods; Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG); Regional partners; Housing/social services
- Philanthropy and family foundations
- Federal money - 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program
- Washington State Housing Trust Fund
- Washington State Housing Finance Commission
- Local banks and CRA Credits
- Housing Authorities are funded through Moving to Work
- Federal and State grants
- Building Changes: Washington Family Fund (innovation funds)
- Social Impact Grants (Utah has a good model)
- Bonds
- Nonprofit and organizational grants - Race to the Top, The Roadmap Project

Table 5 discussed how to make the case for housing and education partnerships - the "<u>value proposition</u>" to potential funders:

- Developments with **wrap-around services** (that include a connection to education)
- A partnership between housing and education **increases the stability** of residents and neighborhoods (with a decrease in transiency) resulting in increases in academic success and the economy more generally
- The community is more connected
- These partnerships take a more holistic approach to services and community mobility, stability and success – a "**whole family" concept**
- Partnerships bring in leveraged an more flexible (broad) resources and more efficiencies
- There's a lot of momentum behind the idea of "**collective impact**"
- Partnerships produce **short and long-term gains**
- Partnerships reinforce accountability

Table 5 spoke to <u>what we need</u> to effectively seek funding to support these partnerships:

- Data
- Policy changes and objective decision-making
- A change in the composition of agency and organization boards with new members from partner agencies and organizations.

- Successful models from others cities/states to showcase to potential funders
- Leveraged resources
- A clear understanding of the benefits from connecting housing and education
- Allies with power and position
- Government needs adequate revenue sources

Table 6: Gaps that Need to filled (and other issues not discussed today)

Facilitators:
Michael Hubner, Principal Planner, PSRC
Trise Moore, Director, Family and Community Partnership, Federal Way School District

Background
In the first section of this program, our panelists discussed approaches to address:

- Achievement gap,
- Access to affordable housing,
- Housing Instability
- School attendance,
- Wrap-around services for families.

Table 6 discussed additional topics not address through in the panel, as well as the gaps and unmet needs that should be addressed through housing and education partnerships:

- **Transportation and public transit cuts:**
  - o Efficiency of money spent for student mobility (McKinney-Vento Act Dollars)
  - o Educational Service District co-op for transportation
  - o Transportation to and/or from school or after school for children and adults
- **Healthy housing** and the intersection with the health care sector
- Funding for GED programs and **reduce eligibility criteria** for employment training
- Early learning
- After school programs – bringing them to where people live
- **Scalability barriers** – funding and organizational structures are often an obstacle
- Role of local governments - comprehensive plans, growth needs, partnerships
- Multi-generational housing needs as part of the community fabric
- Housing affordability for teachers
- Linking education to jobs

Table 7: Place-Based Initiatives

Facilitators**:**
Kayla Schott-Bresler, Policy Manager, Housing Development Consortium
Matthew Gulbranson, Community Partnerships & Systems Director, PSESD

Background
Place-based initiatives seek to improve outcomes in housing, health, education, economic development, and improve social service delivery in a neighborhood through focusing on institutions and partnerships. Many place-based strategies center on schools as the institution. This cross-cutting approach has been a major driver behind the Promise Neighborhood and Choice Neighborhood Programs at the Federal Level.

Table 7 discussed some opportunities to strengthen place-based initiatives:

- Focus on **smaller scale partnerships** that are more concentrated and targeted to the needs of individual communities
- Engage the community in deeper conversations and more long-term planning
- Place-based initiatives could have a **greater appeal to funders** and therefore a more sustainable and lasting impact
- The initiatives should be **accessible** to residents and **defined in community context**
- Focus on **local business** partnerships around employment and funding
- Community leaders/advocates have a clearer idea of the needs of the community in which they live, and should have a voice in place-based partnerships
- Partnership should be **centralized in the neighborhood**, with backbone organizations, different sectors, and community residents at the table

Table 7 also discussed some of the challenges we face with place-based education initiatives:

- As with any partnership, **accountability** can be an issue, as can galvanizing the community to support the partnership and recognize the need
- True transformation takes a very **large and sustainable investment** – we also need to build grassroots capacity for funding
- Projects and programs are subject to big shifts outside your control (e.g. funding)
- Different communities and spaces are in **competition** for things like funding, representation, land, etc.
- It takes a **long time to get accurate metrics** that reflect results
- Tracking discernable outcomes can also affect the creative process
- Place-based initiatives would be challenging in **unincorporated areas**

Finally, Table 7 focused on what we need in order to strengthen opportunities for housing and education partnerships through place-based initiatives:

- Inspired and **aligned leadership** with a shared vision and buy-in
- Creative and **innovative ideas** and partnerships
- A focus on strengthening **business partnerships** and ties to the for-profit community
- Tap the community for **common language** and skills to address cultural barriers
- More face-time between backbone organizations, community residents and government